

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The independent claims have been amended to specify that there is a "display device" at each station serving to show the difference between the actual position of the manually adjustable element at that station and the desired position for this element as stored in a central memory. In addition some minor amendments have been made to sharpen the claim language.

Previously cited US patent 4,554,777 of Roch describes a machine with remotely set elements at the various stations whose positions are monitored centrally and that are reset by respective actuators at the individual stations but controlled by a central processor. This therefore represents one of the first of a standard line of machines where all the stations can be reset centrally by the computer. It is a far cry from the machines that existed up to then, and that were so ruggedly built that they are still in operation all over the world, where the stations were manually adjustable and required a user to go from station to station to reset them.

The instant invention is aimed at the manually adjustable machines and aims to partly computerize them by retrofitting each manually adjustable element with a sensor that reports its position to a central computer and providing each station with a display device which shows any deviation of the position of the element at that station from a centrally stored desired position. Thus with the system of the instant invention, when there is a format change, the machine operator merely moves along the machine from station to station and manually adjusts the elements so their actual positions are their desired positions. In other words the system of this invention is basically a partial computer retrofit and can greatly extend the life of a prior-art manually adjustable machine at considerably less cost than replacing it with a new wholly centrally controlled machine, even factoring in the modest labor cost of the worker who has to do the resets.

There is absolutely nothing whatsoever in Roch to suggest providing a respective display device at each station. Instead FIG. 7 clearly shows that there is one and only one central display provided for the entire machine. Furthermore it is dubious if there are any "manually adjustable elements" at the stations. Instead the adjustable elements at the stations are operated by respective actuators controlled by the central computer. A rejection under §102 on Roch is impossible because critical elements -

respective display devices at each station and manually adjustable elements - are not shown.

A §103 rejection is also out of the question because the entire idea of Roch is to provide a wholly centrally controlled machine. If the Roch system were retrofitted to an old manually adjustable machine, it would require the extraordinarily complex task of supplying special-duty actuators at each manually adjustable element, and would still lack the individual display devices since centralized control is the whole idea of Roch.


US patent 4,554,777 of Denk is largely cumulative to Roch. It discloses a central system with a single display device. There is no way to say there is a respective display device at each work station when there is only one display and several stations. The Denk device does have the interesting idea of providing a roving display coupled with an actuator, but still does not in any way propose a plurality of displays as claimed in this case. Admittedly, Denk is another solution to the problem of a difficult manually controlled machine, but an altogether different one from the instant invention in that Denk uses a single display and a single actuator for operating a plurality of different elements. It is impossible to say that a reference which goes to great pains to show how it is possible to do something at several different places with a single display makes it obvious to provide individual

displays at the different places; instead Denk teaches the opposite. No §102 rejection is possible since the multiple displays are not shown, nor is a §103 rejection possible since the disclosure teaches away from the multiple-display system of this invention.

For these reasons all the claims in the case are clearly in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.


by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

14 January 2004
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosure: None.